UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,099	09/28/2007	Andrew Pacey	697.031US1	8909
21186 7590 07/29/2010 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938			EXAMINER	
			KETTER, JAMES S	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1636	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/29/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com request@slwip.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	10/594,099	PACEY, ANDREW				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	James S. Ketter	1636				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appo Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Ma	ay 2010.					
· <u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	, <del></del>					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19 and 21</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2 and 12-19</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3-11 and 21</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
	·					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 <i>September</i> 2006</u> is/are∶ a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:  1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Claims 2 and 12-19 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 29 October 2009.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-11 and newly added 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. (of record) in view of Atala et al. (A, newly cited).

The instant claims were described previously, except for newly added 21, and except that the claims are now limited to efferent vessel, further comprising generating ultrasonic vibrations in the region of nucleic acid delivery from an ultrasonic oscillator. Claim 21, which depends from claim 1, further specifies that a piezo-electric transducer is the ultrasonic oscillator.

Wolff et al. was described in the previous Office Action. Wolff et al. differs from the claimed invention in not teaching the use of ultrasonic vibrations in the region of nucleic acid delivery from an ultrasonic oscillator. Atala et al. teaches, e.g., at paragraphs [0024] and [0030], a probe which generates ultrasonic waves for use in transfection of a patient's cells, actuated by a piezo-electric transducer. In the Abstract, for example, it is taught that the ultrasonic source may be inside the subject's body. At paragraph [0098], it is taught that the use of ultrasound in gene transfer methods would be advantageous.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method of Wolff et al. by adding the application of ultrasound as taught by Atala et al., motivated by the teaching of Atala et al. at, e.g., paragraph [0098] where it is taught that ultrasonic vibration is advantageous in gene transfer.

To the extent they apply to the present rejection, Applicants' arguments in the amendment filed 25 May 2010 are addressed here. Regarding Applicants' argument against the rejection under 35 USC §102(e), now withdrawn, that Wolff et al. does not have a prior effective filing date, it is noted that US Patent 6,379,966, issued from 09/450,315, upon which Wolff et al. relies for priority, has, e.g., at column 2, first full paragraph, support for the cited teachings of Wolff et al., which is itself supported in priority document 60/146,564, e.g., at the first paragraph, thus providing an effective filing date for Wolff et al. of no later than 30 July 1999.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number: 10/594,099 Page 4

Art Unit: 1636

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to James S. Ketter whose telephone number is 571-272-0770. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JSK

26 July 2010

/James S. Ketter/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1636